

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/918,634	08/01/2001	Yoon-Hyoung Cho	247/033	3246	
75	590 01/26/2005		EXAMINER		
Lee & STERBA, P.C.			PATEL, ASHOK		
Suite 2000 1101 Wilson Be	oulevard		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
Arlington, VA	22209		2879		
			DATE MAILED: 01/26/2009	DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			\ <i>A</i>
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/918,634	CHO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ashok Patel	2879	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper repl h places the applica	ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	<u>EPLY</u> [check either a) or b)]		
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF TH	g date of the final rejecti HE FINAL REJECTION.	on. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amo the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	unt of the fee. The apploriginally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action: or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
$2. \boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or si	mplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:	reconsideration has been consi	dered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we	(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b) ould be rejected is provided belo	□ will be entered a w or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 3</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	he Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		
10.☐ Other:		-	
	•	Ashok Patel Primary Examiner	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03) Continuation of 2. NOTE: newly added structural limitations in claims 1 and 3 are not sufficient to distinguish the claimed structure from that of the prior art of the record. The newly added limitations in claims 1 and 3, appear to be disclosed in, or taught by, the prior art of the record. As discussed during the interview, the claims need to recite a specific structure that is not disclosed in, or taught by, the prior art of the record.